

MM 93-48

**From:** Michael Brownfield <mbrownfi@TSO.Cin.IX.net>  
**To:** A16.A16(kidstv)  
**Date:** 10/12/95 6:22pm  
**Subject:** MM Docket 93-48

RECEIVED

OCT 13 1995

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

RE: MM Docket 93-48

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

The FCC should require at least 1 hour morning and 1 hour afternoon for children programs.

These shows should teach family values, social skills, biblical history and basic education. Examples might be:  
Sesame Street, Barney & Friends and Gullah  
Gullah Island. No violence or good verses evil type shows.

No. of Copies rec'd 1  
List ABCDE

MM 93-48

RECEIVED

**From:** Anita Castagna <LXE\_ANITA@lcls.lib.il.us>  
**To:** A16.A16(kidstv)  
**Date:** 10/12/95 6:49pm  
**Subject:** Re: Comment on Kids TV.

OCT 13 1995

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

I am the mother of a 2 year old at the moment I have full control on what my child watches. He watches PBS and sports with my husband(no control over that).

I am concerned that when he does get some control over the "REMOTE" that all he will have to choose from is the CRAP that is offered by commercial TV today.

What are governments for is not to work with parents to take care of our children, our future. PLEASE PLEASE help in a small way to turn this country around, legislate to make programmers more responsible for putting educational programmes on TV. Thank you for inviting my comments.

Anita Castagna  
14 Huntwood Rd  
Belleville IL. 62221

No. of Copies rec'd \_\_\_\_\_  
List ABCDE \_\_\_\_\_

MM 93-48

RECEIVED

OCT 13 1995

**From:** Thomas Hannigan <thann@fiat.gslis.utexas.edu>  
**To:** A16.A16(kidstv)  
**Date:** 10/12/95 7:16pm  
**Subject:** MM Docket No. 93-48

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

Dear Sir:

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

I'm writing to express my concerns about the lack of quality control on children's television programing. I believe broadcasters should meet high standards so kids are not exposed to crash commercialism of little value. Children's prgramming should, in my opinion, provide high-quality educational and informational content. I am particulary concerned about this issue because I soon will be a librarian who might end up serving the needs of children. Too many of today's programs are speifically designed to sell toys. There should be none. Our children are our future; I believe we should provide the finest in children's programming that will prepare them for tomorrow's world.

Thank you

Thomas Hannigan | thann@gslis.utexas.edu |  
<http://fiat.gslis.utexas.edu:80/~thann/index.html>

No. of Copies rec'd \_\_\_\_\_  
List ABCDE \_\_\_\_\_

MM 93-48

RECEIVED

OCT 13 1995

From: <jbellas1@ic3.ithaca.edu>  
To: A16.A16(KIDSTV)  
Date: 10/12/95 8:34pm

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Honorable Commissioners:

The quality of programming specifically for children is often poor. Not much money is spent on children's educational programs. Also, some of the programs already in progress are inappropriate. Something must be done to improve the quality of television programming offered to children.

According to the Christian Science Monitor, "Television plays a role that experts and even some industry executives now consider indisputable: For better or for worse, it is a powerful educator and major socializer of children."

One major concern about television is the rise in violence. According to The Miami Herald, "Violence in entertainment makes some children more aggressive, desensitizes them to real-life violence, and makes them feel they live in a mean and dangerous world." For example, the hugely popular show, "Mighty Morphin Power Rangers," is a particularly violent television show. Children under the age of 10 often do not realize that programs like this are not real life.

The media needs to become more sensitive and responsible toward children's television. According to the Christian Science Monitor, "As one measure of hopeful new ways in which the industry is taking children's needs to heart, ABC plans to convene a children's advisory panel. Already the network uses a "family viewing" logo to identify programs for young audiences. Some things are being done, but there is always room for improvement,

The children are our future. We need to prepare them for what lies ahead. "When television underachieves, it can contribute to the under achievement of a whole generation," according to the Christian Science Monitor.

Television shapes the nation's culture and values. Children are very impressionable. Something must be done to control what is shown on television. Newton Minow, former chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, goes so far as to call it the "most important influence in America, particularly with the children."

Media is very influential. It serves a purpose to the community. That is why it should play a key role in improving the quality of television programming.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Bellask

CC: MASSMEDIA <MASSMEDIA@ic3.ithaca.edu>

No. of Copies rec'd  
List ABCDE

MM93-48

RECEIVED

From: <lfreema1@ic3.ithaca.edu>  
To: A16.A16(KIDSTV)  
Date: 10/12/95 10:18pm

OCT 13 1995

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Dear Honorable FCC Commissioners:

The impact of violence and advertising on television is an issue of economics, rather than child safety. The effect television has on children deals more with business. The quality of the programming is declining. Broadcasters would rather ensure their economic security than ensure the quality of the programs. For example, the first program length commercial: Hot Wheels produced a show for the purpose of promoting their product. The television network aired the show, despite possible repercussions.

Many children under the age of seven can not distinguish between the shows themselves and the advertisements (Journal of Communication, volume 38, Autumn 1988). The Hot Wheels case is just the first example of shows that cater to advertisers.

Programs such as this prompt organizations like ACT (Action for Children's Television) to force the FCC into taking action. More organizations of this kind will be necessary if this promotional program is going to be stopped.

Despite laws, such as the "clear separation principle" (1974), program length commercials continue. Today, everything from toys to celebrities are promoted in children's television. The Mighty Morphin Power Rangers, exists to promote the toys. It has obviously been effective: children across the country are Power Ranger crazy.

Children are encouraged to be like the Power Rangers. I think the need for some type of advertising regulation is more clear today than it ever has been.

The FCC has relied on the creators of these shows to be responsible for themselves. It may have worked for a while (seven years ago), but I think these people might have outgrown the "raised eyebrow" strategy of inducing self-reform. This strategy was used in place of governmental reform. Unfortunately, I think this reform is necessary today.

The threat of reform, however, is one that could change today's media forever. Whether you are discussing advertising, violence, or obscenity, (though the three are often one) regulation is a topic that deserves much debate. Regulating television is something that goes against American ideals. Children's programming, though, is a topic that should seriously yield consideration.

Since the 1970s, children's programming has decreased from 30-37 hours per week to less than twenty hours a week. This week's issue of T.V. Guide (October 14-20) has outlined thirteen special shows for kids for the entire week. Three of these programs are movies, the rest are half hour comedies such as Saved by the Bell and some educational programs like Bill Nye the Science Guy. Because of this decrease, it is likely that program length commercials will squeeze out the other shows. Because companies buy advertising space during the programs that their products are aired, and they are willing to pay more during their shows, educational and non-product related programs are not aired. If action is not taken soon, children's television will consist only of these product based shows.

CC: FCCMAIL.SMTP("MASSMEDIA@LIBER.ITHACA.EDU")

No. of Copies rec'd \_\_\_\_\_  
List ABCDE \_\_\_\_\_

MM93-48

RECEIVED

From: <cpeters1@ic3.ithaca.edu>  
To: A16.A16(kidstv)  
Date: 10/12/95 11:03pm  
Subject: Children's tv

OCT 13 1995

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

10/13/95  
To: Secretary:FCC

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Any babysitter or parent could tell you exactly how many young children behave as they are watching television programming defined by some programming guides as "educational." they sit in front of the TV screen, mesmerized completely by the images and sounds, yet devoid of any semblance of interpretation of or interaction with the show's content. they begin to resemble miniature versions of the classic couch potato, coming home from school and plopping down in front of the set with their afternoon snack and remote control both within easy grabbing distance. This image is the nightmare of the busy parent, who hates to think that their latchkey son or daughter simply wastes their afternoon away in front of the boob tube. Conscientious parents would love to spend more time with their children, to educate and entertain them themselves. Unfortunately, as more and more parents simply can't be there when Johnny gets home from school, TV has assumed the role of babysitter and role model to millions of bored, impressionable young minds. It is because of this overwhelming responsibility that children's programming must maintain the highest standards possible for quality and educational value.

The Children's Television Act of 1990 set out to fill this enormous responsibility with the best of intentions. Rather than letting TV continue to merely fill a void in children's everyday routines, it tried to establish programs that would further "the positive development of the child in any respect, including the child's cognitive/intellectual or emotional/social needs." Unfortunately, as some critics have pointed out, the language of the act allows for lax interpretation of the standards it established. Almost any children's show, regardless of content or quality, could slip through due to the usage of the term "in any respect." the "emotional/social" needs of a child could conceivably be fulfilled by a show such as "Saved By The Bell," an inane sitcom with a target audience of pre-teens, simply because it shows kids in social situations and interactions. the Act's terminology is one of its main downfalls, one that can be corrected by requiring more specific quality standards and definitions of "intellectual or social" needs.

Another major downfall that has rendered the Act ineffective is the lack of enforcement of the regulations themselves. The FCC wants to cut down on regulation and put the power in the hands of the viewing public, but this may not be a good strategy to start out with. An argument for regulation is given by Dale Kunkel and Julie Canepa in a report in the Journal of Broadcasting and electronic Media (v38,#4,Fall 1994. pp 397-416). Kunkel and Canepa point out that the amount of educational programming seen now is only slightly higher than the 1977-78 figure of 2.6 hours per week. they also argue that the claims of educational programming made by stations were often "vague or imprecise and made no direct reference to the FCC's criterion." Because rules about reporting were so sketchy, only 71% of the stations sampled in the study offered even the minimal required recordkeeping. Without a certain amount of overseeing by the government, the broadcasters don't appear to take the FCC's new rules seriously.

The government can also take responsibility for seeing that the educational content of the programs is monitored and kept consistent with certain quality levels. Kunkel and Canepa suggest that independent scholars engage in regular analysis of the shows to determine their educational merit. I strongly agree with the idea of independent evaluation. it would keep the broadcasters under scrutiny and hold them responsible for the fruits of their labor or the consequences of their lack thereof. However, like any objective evaluation, the independent analysis of these shows must be kept completely independent, so as to avoid pressure from advertisers or networks.

One such evaluative procedure presented in MM Docket 93-48 proposes that audience input is the best judgment of a program's quality. the standard could be very effective in improving program content, but only if audience input is easily available to the network. the proposed network contact representative must be made very accessible to the busy parents whose children will be most affected by the programming.

In short, the new principles presented by the FCC could make a huge difference in programming quality, but only if specific guidelines are made and followed, and if loopholes are immediately taken care of as soon as they are detected.

Christine Peterson  
Ithaca College  
Ithaca, NY

CC: FCCMAIL.SMTP("massmedia@liber.ithaca.edu")

No. of Copies rec'd  
List ABCDE

MM93-48

RECEIVED

From: Jeremy Allen <JALLEN2@ic3.ithaca.edu>  
To: A16.A16(kidstv)  
Date: 10/12/95 11:06pm

OCT 13 1995

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

To whom it may concern:

Violence in children's television is a problem that needs attention from the FCC. Children are exposed to programming that could possibly affect their attitudes and behavior in the future. It has been well documented that such relations between programming and behavior exist. The question is, how do we control what children take in on the television? There have been steps taken in the past. Parental advisory warnings have been instituted to warn parents of inappropriate programming for children. Steps are being taken for the future; the V-chip is being tested and discussed for implementation. This would allow parents to directly control what their children watch. But for now, we have to rely on FCC Guidelines and parental supervision. Obviously, parents either can't or won't supervise their children when they watch television, so other steps must be taken so that media does not corrupt our youth.

The answer isn't taking all the violent Television shows off the air. That could prove difficult to do. What stations should do, is air more programs that are educational for children. Not only should they be educational, but they should also appeal to the children. Make the shows fun to watch.

Sesame Street is a perfect example that education does not have to be boring, and even though advertising for such programs is scarce, if such programs become mandatory, stations will have to find ways to finance them.

Maybe they could allocate some advertising funds from other shows to support their educational programming. Funding is not the problem. If stations are ordered to air educational programming, they will find a way to finance them.

The other question that remains is, how do we require that educational programming be aired? That answer is one that's extremely difficult to answer. The improvements on the CTA are definitely in the right direction. Educational programming is a must, there is no replacement for education, so anything that can be done to encourage stations to air this type of programming on a regular basis is a definite plus. However, to recommend that educational programs be aired is not enough. Actual rules must be enacted with specific steps that spell out what stations are required to do. For example, a station must submit to the FCC a show that they consider to be educational. Then, after the commission approves it, the station would be required to air it on a regular basis. If these rules are not followed, fines should be imposed; give the stations the proper incentive to follow the rules.

Television stations don't air the educational programming that they should because it is not financially secure. What the FCC needs to do is make it so not airing these shows becomes financially insecure. If a station knows that it will lose more money by not airing educational programming than by actually airing it, chances are the shows will get aired.

Until actual anti-violence technology such as the V-chip is approved, we must rely on the parents and the television stations to control what children see. So far, it hasn't completely worked. Parents have not been able to control their children, and stations have managed to find ways around the current guidelines. Being that the FCC cannot control what parents do with their children, the best that they can do is toughen the guidelines. That would be an improvement on the current situation, so my advice to you. Make tougher laws concerning the control of educational children's programming. Make today's children smarter, not more violent.

Sincerely,

Jeremy Allen

1005 East Tower  
Ithaca College  
953 Danby Rd.  
Ithaca, NY

14850-7231

CC: FCCMAIL.SMTP("massmedia@liber.ithaca.edu")

No. of Copies rec'd  
List ABCDE

1

MM 93-48

RECEIVED

From: <EDono317@aol.com>  
To: A16.A16(kidstv)  
Date: 10/12/95 11:09pm  
Subject: Violence In Childrens TV

OCT 13 1995

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

Violence In Children s Television

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Dear FCC,

I m sick and tired of so many people complaining about too much violence on television, especially in children s programs. Yes, there are many shows that may go overboard with violence, but there are also plenty of other shows available in which good morals and values are practiced regularly. The parents who complain about this issue are concerned with their child s well-being, but also are complaining because they lack either the time, energy, or capital to monitor their children s viewing tendencies. It is my belief that there is plenty of good on television, and that many people have a tendency to blow things out of proportion. There is no direct evidence proving that watching violent television will severely alter a child s behavior, making him or her a problem.

Firstly, there are a significant amount of alternate childrens' shows which can be viewed if parents are not keen on letting their child watch Teenage Mutant Ninja Turtles,¶ or Double Dragon.¶ A show named Mister Rodger s Neighborhood,¶ has been on television for as long as I can remember, and that isn t the only one. Shows such as Sesame Street,¶ also serve as excellent childrens' television programs. In every popular press article I read concerning this issue, the writer proceeds to name a viable list of quality¶ shows, these shows are not limited in number either. This doesn t suggest to me or any other logical thinker that this is the epidemic so many have portrayed it to be.

It is very difficult for working parents to monitor their children watching television, and these parents should have a say in what their kids watch. I specifically remember a contrast between a good friend and myself many years back. My friend s parents would not care if he watched violent television or movies, while on the other hand, my parents were very strict, not allowing me to view such material. However all throughout his life, my friend has been one of the kindest people I know, never engaging in violence, even after all the gory violence he witnessed on screen. While I haven t exactly been a criminal, I must admit I have been involved in a few more quarrels than my friend. This real-life example shoots down the notion that as children watch violence they become more violent. People have their own minds, therefore they can think for themselves as to what is wrong and right. They will determine whether to use force, not a television show. The only way that children consistently become more violent is to be involved in it. In all likelihood a gang member will become more violent over the years, due in large part to his involvement, not his exposure to violent television.

No question about it, violence is a serious matter, and most parents rightfully try to shield their children away from it, but most agree it is a person s emotions that make him or her violent. If someone just suffered through a bad relationship, or one of the many other hardships of life, he or she is more likely to commit a violent crime than a 10 year old who has just watched Teenage Mutant Ninja Turtles.¶ I believe a more appropriate way for parents to deal with childrens' violence is not to curb their television viewing, but to talk to them about real life experiences and ready them for the problems they will suffer through.

Over the years, mass media, especially television has been wrongly targeted as a source for many of society s problems, while in fact society itself is the problem. I also feel that it is a large waste of time and money to continually research matters in this area. People are not becoming vicious as a result of watching violent television, and I think its time everyone should realize that. Instead, I feel that money going to violent television¶ research should be spent trying to quell violence both on the streets and in schools, and then people will see a real difference.

CC: FCCMAIL.SMTP("massmedia@liber.ithaca.edu")

No. of Copies rec'd  
List ABCDE



MM 93-48

RECEIVED

OCT 13 1995

From: Richard Kronberg <kronberg@corcomsv.corcom.com>  
To: A16.A16(kidstv)  
Date: 10/12/95 11:26pm  
Subject: MM Docket No. 93-48

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

My name is Richard Kronberg. I would like to submit testimony in reference to docket MM Docket No. 93-48 "What you want in children's programming.

I am a teacher and the parent of two elementary school age children. I have seen at home and in my class the products of children's television.

The results have not been a testimonial to the desire or ability of television networks to provide quality shows for children. There is an overabundance of violence in these shows. There is no attempt made on these shows to impart the values we all believe in. There need to be

Guidelines put in place so that the people who program television shows will have to be concerned about the millions of children who are watching the shows. It is no accident that American communities are becoming more violent places to live. Children emulate what they see. What they are seeing on television is violence and more violence. The specific violent characters portrayed on television go through periodic changes. As each new fad comes along, these are the characters the children are portraying. In other words, when one child is acting out a violent scene he has witnessed on television he is pretending to be the specific character he has just observed on television.

Many children get up early and stay up late. Concern about the children watching television can not simply be a matter for Saturday mornings.

Guidelines need to be established for every day of the week, from early in the morning, i.e. 6 AM, until late in the evening, i.e 11 PM.

Thank you for this opportunity to submit testimony.

Rich Kronberg                      kronberg@corcom.com  
3511 Chiniak Bay Drive          RKronberg@aol.com  
Anchorage, AK 99515

No. of Copies rec'd \_\_\_\_\_  
List ABCDE

MM93-48

RECEIVED

From: <rfarrin1@ic3.ithaca.edu>  
Date: 10/12/95 12:41pm  
Subject: Re: your mail

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

OCT 13 1995

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

I disagree with kidstv. If television was a mirror image of the society that we live in, no one would watch it. Do you go to a movie or watch a television program to see people doing normal, everyday stuff? No. You pay that seven dollars and buy popcorn to see larger-than-life, fantastical character action and plot. Not to see Joe Shmoe walk down the street whistling "It's a wonderful day in the neighborhood". True, many violent or misbehaved people have problems that deviate beyond the television set, but you cannot say that imagery and fiction do not have an impact on people in forming their dreams, morals, and ideologies.

rfarrin1

On Wed, 11 Oct 1995 jgabari1@ic3.ithaca.edu wrote:

> I grew up watching Rambo and Gi joe all the time and Now i'm a Pacifist. > Violent people aren't violent because they watch too much TV, they ARE > VIOLENT BECAUSE they are stupid primates that are still stuck in the > trees. They way to prevent violence is educate properly and to remove > violent people from society. The TV is a mirror image of the world we > live in. By stopping violence in society the amount violece on Television > would go down. > Peace  
>

CC: A16.A16(kidstv),FCCMAIL.SMTP("massmedia@liber.itha...

No. of Copies rec'd  
List ABCDE

MM 93-48

RECEIVED

OCT 13 1995

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

From: <cmcquin1@ic3.ithaca.edu>  
To: A16.A16(kidstv)  
Date: 10/13/95 1:07am  
Subject: re: children's television

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

FCC commissioners:

Recently I did a great deal of research on the subject of children's television for a course on Mass Media at Ithaca College. Through many journal articles, I learned of the FCC's plan to open the children's programming question to the public. I decided to respond with my own opinion on the matter and thus take active part in government for the first time.

There were many instants of government funding for children's television cited in the various articles. Questions were raised as to how much should be spent on children's programming, and if there should be any expenditure at all. The V-chip was brought up numerous times, sometimes implying a future for an S(ex)-chip and an L(anguage)-chip. One thing stood out above all and made the most sense to myself personally, though: family responsibility.

One article from the Journal of Contemporary Human Services illustrated the logic behind beginning children's programming with family and education in mind. The piece described the importance on parents and guardians, or teachers, being able to supervise their children or students in what is being viewed. Government cannot be the ultimate watchdog in media; something can and will slip through the cracks. And neither do all parents care to know what the kids are watching these days. What could be tolerant to one family, may be completely out of the question to another.

But in order for those caring parents and teachers to set aside the time to play the role of gatekeeper for their children, it helps to interest the adults, also. In the 1990s, pure devotion to a child's future as a healthy, happy human being is simply not enough to motivate parents. Between taking the kids to practice and cooking dinner, the average family will not easily have the time to sit together as a whole unit to monitor television viewing. When a mother or father can squeeze in a glance at the television between chores, they certainly it will be worth the wait.

Thus, it would be a great step to create children's television programming with a family audience in mind, child and thirty-something parent. Then the broadcast times of these programs should be made known to parents, and encouraged through advertising appealing to both age groups. Certainly, programs like "Barney" may have some educational merit for children, but it loses that certain attraction for adults. Perhaps this is one area that already has been in the process of development, and I feel it should be continued.

Setting this rhetoric aside, I really admire the effort that the FCC is making to gather public opinion on the issue of children's television programming. It proves a great deal to the people of the nation that the Commission does think that the public counts. Thank you.

Corey McQuinn

No. of Copies rec'd  
List ABCDE

MM 93-48

RECEIVED

From: <plepage1@ic3.ithaca.edu>  
To: A16.A16(kidstv)  
Date: 10/13/95 1:38am  
Subject: childre's television

OCT 13 1995

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

FCC commissioners

My name is Pete LePage and I am a communication major attending Ithaca college. I agree with President Bill Clinton when he said parents should spend more time with their kids and educate them about television shows and what they can and cannot watch. ( "Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents" July 17, 1995 v31 n28 p1210(3) )

I also think that the V-chip is a good idea because it again stresses the importance of the parents getting involved. If a show has too much violence or sexual content the parents can decide to block out the show with the v-chip. ( "Media Week" July 24, 1995 v5 n29 p16(1) )

I disagree with the Children Television Act to a point. I think that the government should not tell Broadcasters when to schedule educational television. Government cannot make kids watch "educational" programming. ( "U.S. News and World Report" September 11, 1995 v119 n10 p70(1) )

On the other hand having a couple of children's educational television shows is a good idea, but I do not think it would be a good idea if they had too many educational television shows and the cartoons didn't get as much air time, or if they took all the positive cartoons or children's television away from the kids that I had a chance to benefit and grow from. the classics for example (Looney Tunes).

The important thing is to have the parents talk with the children about what is real and what is just on television. They should explain to their children that the violence on the television is not appropriate or inappropriate and just because it is on television doesn't mean that it is okay to imitate. Tell their children what kind of television is permissible for the children to watch and which shows they cannot watch. That is why the V-chip is a good idea it will block out what the children shouldn't be watching.

I do not think the V-chip should be a mandatory thing to have in all the televisions because some people might not want the V-chip in their television. It should be optional for parents who want to have it because some parents might not want the V-chip at all in their television because they might want to watch some programs on that particular station themselves. Programs their kids shouldn't watch but they might want to watch. The Children's Television Act wants television stations between 6 a.m. and 11 p.m. but that is a big time slot and they might air educational programming at times when few children could be watching. They could put it on when children are at school. On the other hand if they don't put the television shows on when the children are watching how are they going to get any good ratings or any good money. Broadcasters strongly feel that the government should not tell them how to run their television scheduling. ( "Media Week" April 10, 1995 v5 n15 p6(1) ) I could see how that would upset them being told what to do is never any good. They might lose money or viewers.

No. of Copies rec'd \_\_\_\_\_  
List ABCDE \_\_\_\_\_

11493-48

RECEIVED

From: <wcmurt1@ic3.ithaca.edu>  
To: A16.A16(kidstv)  
Date: 10/13/95 2:14am

OCT 13 1995

Bill McMurtrie  
Ithaca College  
Lyon Hall-312  
953 Danby Road  
Ithaca, New York  
14850-7221

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Honorable Commissioners of the FCC:

I am a freshman at Ithaca College majoring in Journalism. I recently learned of your upcoming vote concerning violence on television and children through my Introduction to Mass Media class. This letter is regarding my opinion on a subject that many people are talking about. I firmly believe that there is no need to put restrictions on the amount of violence on television.

If I think back to when I was younger, cartoons, sit-coms and other prime time shows would often contain different forms of violence both in comical and realistic forms. I didn't choose to turn what I saw into reality because I was taught the differences between fantasy and reality.

Some may argue that the problem lays in those who DO NOT have this parental guidance and don't learn to make a distinction. To that I would say rather than limiting what the action/adventure/drama fan can view, simply require networks to convey a message to their viewers. A brief warning from the actors and actresses, for example, would be a great way to let kids know that the contents are fictional and should not be attempted in real life.

Even broadcasting short clips promoting non-violence throughout a viewing day could be enough to sway a child who is "unsure." I think we should also understand that there are and will forever be children in this country who cannot grasp the true meaning of reality. They will inevitably do things to hurt others or themselves with regard to nobody.

I ask you to understand that taking something away from someone will not solve any problems. EDUCATING and INFORMING the children will teach them what is right, in turn causing them to make better decisions. There are people who enjoy entertainment containing violence for the simple appreciation of what has been created. I hope you will consider these people when making a final decision. Education through entertainment CAN work and I am confident that could make children think twice.

Thank you very much for your time and consideration.

Sincerely Yours,  
Bill McMurtrie

CC: FCCMAIL.SMTP("massmedia@liber.ithaca.edu")

No. of Copies rec'd  
List ABCDE

MM 93-48

From: <kcoppol1@ic3.ithaca.edu>  
To: A16.A16(KIDSTV)  
Date: 10/13/95 9:33am

RECEIVED

OCT 13 1995

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

Ithaca College  
953 Danby Rd.  
Ithaca, NY 14850

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

October 5, 1995

Secretary, Federal Communications Commission  
1919 M Street N.W.  
Washington DC 20554

To Whom It May Concern:

Children's television has changed drastically since my parents were kids. When my family sits down at the dinner table and the discussion of children's violence on TV comes up there are many different things to be said. My parents grew up on Leave it to Beaver, S R Love Lucy, S those kind of shows. I grew up on The Muppet Show, S and Sesame Street. S Now it's 1995 and my four brothers and sisters, ranging from five to eight years of age, are growing up watching Mighty Morphin-Power Rangers, S and Teenage Mutant Ninja Turtles. S You don't have to be a rocket scientist to realize the difference in content of these various programs. There is a rather direct comparison to the rise in violence of television shows in the years and the rise in the crime rate. It's a known fact that children don't have the money to spend on educational programs for themselves; therefore, the producers of these violent shows are producing them because it's cheaper than spending the money on educational programs. So you ask yourself, why do these producers originate these shows if there is such a negative effect on the children? It's like their purposely sucking these children into an abyss of violence. The children that are watching these programs will someday be our leaders. These kids see these forcible TV shows and not all children are mentally advanced enough to realize that what's going on during the shows is fake. These kids think that this is what really goes on in the American society. Yet the fact that I find most interesting is that these producers just keep on producing. Yeah the bucks are rolling in, why should they stop. Are these producers thinking ethically? In my mind they can't possibly be. It amazes me how many people there are in this country that find money to be the most precious value of all. The shows are still going to be aired but why can't they be made with less violence? They could substitute the idea of friendship, caring or any other positive impression in every place they have acts of violence. I would love to see a show like that. At first sure kids would laugh and mock it, but after awhile it would become second nature. The programs would basically cost the same and yet the message portrayed would make a world of a difference. I know my ideas will be just one of many. I just ask that you look at all the consequences that lie ahead, and make the choices that will have the best possible outcome.

Sincerely,

Kelli Coppola

Student of I.C.

Age: 18

CC: FCCMAIL.SMTP("MASSMEDIA@LIBER.ITHACA.EDU")

No. of Copies rec'd  
List ABCDE

MM 93-48  
DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

OCT 13 1995

**From:** Julie Ann McDaniel <jamcdani@CC.OWU.EDU>  
**To:** A16.A16(kidstv)  
**Date:** 10/13/95 11:07am  
**Subject:** MM Docket No. 93-48 -- more educational programming for children

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

To Whom it May Concern at the Federal Communications Commission,

I would like to encourage you to require network television companies to provide more educational television programming aimed at children. I am a parent who finds it very difficult to locate any programs of value to my son on commercial television stations. I understand that the commercial television networks may be receiving \$37 billion worth of free access to the airways from the government. Certainly, in exchange for this, the networks could provide programs that will help our children learn. These programs need to be scheduled at times when children are awake and available to view them. They also need to be regularly scheduled so that children and parents will know when to tune in.

Please require the networks to increase their educational programming to help our children benefit from the time they spend helping the networks raise revenues by viewing their commercials.

Julie Ann McDaniel  
3629 N. Ludlow Road  
Urbana, OH 43015-9510

No. of Copies rec'd \_\_\_\_\_  
List ABCDE \_\_\_\_\_

MM 93-48

RECEIVED

OCT 13 1995

From: <jfinoch1@ic3.ithaca.edu>  
To: A16.A16(Kidstv)  
Date: 10/13/95 12:05pm  
Subject: Jill Finochio JFINOCH1

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

To whom it may concern:

I have been recently reading about the problems with violence in television which is affecting children in our society. I have been specifically reading the opinions of Reed Hundt, chairman of the FCC. Many of his concerns are very important to me because I feel that children should be entertained with education instead of violence.

For one thing I agree with Hundt's proposal of airing at least three hours of educational programming each week. I think that would be a start to better education on the television. I find it very comforting that the Federal Appeals Court ruled in favor of the FCC on June 30, 1995. "They now have the latitude to place content restrictions on indecent or violent television programs and to require stations to carry children's educational programs" (Stern 1). A specific example of violence on television is the famous cartoon "The Power Rangers." I feel that this cartoon shows an extreme amount of violence and that it is routinely watched by the children in America. All of the killing, fighting, and aggression is not what children should be watching on television to become more educated. This type of action is entertaining for the children, but it is not healthy for their minds. Children see this type of lifestyle and they believe that this is what real life is all about. When children at a young age watch this kind of violence, even though it is a cartoon, they tend not to be able to decipher real from make-believe. I think that this ruling by the Federal Appeals Court is the first step in taking a new direction towards children's education on television.

"The Power Rangers" is not the only show on television that shows too much violence for children. During the hours of 6:00 AM and 10:00 PM many indecent programs are aired. "Cops," "Highway Patrol," and even "Unsolved Mysteries," are inappropriate for young children. Most of these shows are aired past ten, but you can often find re-runs during the day. These shows reflect the negative in our society, instead of the positive. Children now days need to see more positive and optimistic shows since there tends to be so much violence not only on television, but in the movies and real world as well. Even though such programs as "Barney" tend to come off as a bit unrealistic in the real world, it gives young children a sense of happiness and goodness in their heart. The songs they sing and teach the children are about friends, family, and love. Children need to hear these words, they do not need to see all of the killing and violence that occurs on television, especially in some cartoons.

The children today are the adults of tomorrow. If we do not teach them the right and appropriate values then in the future we may be in for something that is out of control. It is time to begin shows on reading, writing, and interacting with others. I strongly believe that this ruling will make a significant positive affect on the children in our society.

Sincerely,  
Jill Finochio

CC: FCCMAIL.SMTP("MassMedia@Liber.Ithaca.edu")

No. of Copies rec'd  
List ABCDE



MM 93-48

RECEIVED

OCT 13 1995

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

From: Sharon Husmoe <Sharon\_Husmoe@everett.wednet.edu>  
To: A16.A16(kidstv)  
Date: 10/13/95 12:32pm  
Subject: TV Violence

I am sending this letter for Mr. Mark Neese, a Board member in the Everett School District, Everett, Washington, regarding violence on TV.

October 10, 1995

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary  
1919 M Street N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Mr. Secretary:

As parents and members of the Board of Directors of the Everett School District, Everett Washington, we would like to offer our comments to the FCC regarding implementation and possible changes to the Children's Television Act.

We urge commissioners to require responsible programming of our nation's broadcasters. The airwaves do, indeed, belong to the public and federal regulation of certain aspects of the use of the public's resource is most appropriate. Children and families today are subject to a range of violent and sexually explicit programming never before witnessed in our country.

It is not enough to passively suggest that parents should simply turn off the TV when something arises that is not appropriate for children. Parents often do not have that choice and not because they are negligent, but because the pressures of modern life prohibit 24-hour scrutiny of children's activities.

Reasonable regulation of commercial programming during prime-time hours is within the purview of the FCC's role and should be exercised. With reasonable regulation should come a commitment of enforcement. It is not enough to "encourage" or "recommend" that the industry "try" to limit unacceptable programming.

We are not suggesting that freedom of speech or expression be abridged in this request. We are requesting that the FCC require that the television industry use reasonable restraint in what they choose to carry during "family" viewing time.

On behalf of the 17,000 children in our schools, we urge you to act responsibly and to use the authority you have to help stem this tide. We are becoming a nation of desensitized people no longer able to sort fact, vulgarity, and violence from truth, good taste, and respect for human life.

Sincerely,

Mark A. Nesse  
Legislative Liaison  
Everett School District  
Board of Directors

No. of Copies rec'd \_\_\_\_\_  
List ABCDE \_\_\_\_\_

MM 93-48

From: \* <econnel1@ic3.ithaca.edu>  
To: A16.A16(kidstv)  
Date: 10/13/95 12:54pm  
Subject: kids/tv/violece

RECEIVED

OCT 13 1995

216,Eastman Hall  
Ithaca College  
953 Danby Rd.  
Ithaca, Ny 14580-7222

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

To Whom It May Concern;

My name is Erika Connell, and I feel that I am a mature and liberal person on the verge of adulthood. And I have been a camp counselor, a peer advisor and a swimming instructor for several years. I had contact with children virtually everyday, and I could tell which ones watched what programs by how they acted. Now, I know that you have heard the same stuff about case studies of children and the shows they watch. And you have more than likely read hundreds of studies on inner city violece related to television. Therefore, I'm not going to spew the carefully witten letter I had prepared; instead I'm going to tell you my feelings, not my findings.

I grew up in a pretty liberal household. My parents were, and still are aging hippies. My younger brother and I have always been allowed to do basically what ever we want. We watched all sorts of television shows, ranging from "The LoveBoat" to "G.I. Joe". As of right now, I'm a Freshman at Ithaca College and my younger brother has skipped a few grades and is a fourteen year old junior in high school. Pretty good for a couple of "G.I. Joe" watchers. I know that there is alot of unnessesary violence on television today, but why are you holding the programers, producers and writers at fault? Where are the parents in this equation?

I don't think that the Government should have to make any sort special "rules" for children's programming. I already have one set of parents, I know I don't need another! What should be done is that the Government should make it mandatory that every channel put on more educational shows for children at peak viewing hours for kids! Not every home gets Nickolodeon, not every kid can watch "Mr.Wizards World" or "Nick News". The educational show should be placed on network as well. A news show primarily for chldre and pre-teens to help them understand what is going on in the world today is a very good and quite a practical one at that.

Parents have legal control of their children until the time that they (the children) reach the age of 18. So until then, parents can, and should, monitor what they (the children) watch. But that's when it gets all muddled. There are alot of single parents homes as well as lots of homes where both parents work. Who is to monitor the kids then? When my best firend and her sisters were younger, both of her parents worked. They were not allowed to watch MTV because of something their mother had seen on there. And you know what, they never put it on, not with all the peer pressure and pleading from friends. They knew the rules and thats how it was. Her parents weren't strict by any means, they just knew that mom said "no".

I know that not every child is like that, and I know that not every parent is going to make the effort to monitor the viewing habbits of their children. However those parents are going to be the one making the biggest stink about violece on television, so lets make them happy.

I recently read an article from the July 24, 1995 issue of Time Magazine concerning the "V" chip. This chip would "allow parents to lock out programs previously identified as having a certain level of violence" (Bellafante, Time, 7/95). This is a good idea in theory, but one step closer to crossing that fine line set by the First Amendment. But, until parents take back control of their children from the "G.I. Joes", the "Mighty Morphin Power Rangers", and the "Barny's", the only way to solve this problem is by Governmental intervention and wide spread installation of the "V" chip. However, I agree with President Clinton when he said "This is not censorship. This is parental responsibility" (Time, 7/95).

CC: econnel1 <econnel1@ic3.ithaca.edu>

No. of Copies rec'd  
List ABCDE

MM 93-48

RECEIVED

OCT 13 1995

**From:** <PARKREF\_ILL@WYLD.STATE.WY.US>  
**To:** A16.A16(kidstv)  
**Date:** 10/13/95 2:23pm  
**Subject:** MM Docket No. 93-48

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

My name is Colleen Williams and I am writing in favor of the Children's Television Act (MM Docket No. 93-48). As a children's librarian, former teacher and parent, I feel that the Processing Guideline should consist of at least one hour of "core" educational programming daily. The FCC is and Congress are ready to give away \$37 billion worth of free access to airwaves and should demand quality children's programming in return.

Thank you.  
Colleen Williams  
Cody, Wyoming

No. of Copies rec'd  
List ABCDE

MM 93-48

RECEIVED

**From:** Donna McIntosh <dmcintosh@kent.wednet.edu>  
**To:** A16.A16(kidstv)  
**Date:** 10/13/95 3:17pm  
**Subject:** Input to FCC Regarding Violence and Sex on TV

OCT 13 1995

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

-----\_35804604==\_  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

Enclosed is a letter from the Kent School District Board of Directors regarding concern about violence and sex on TV.

-----\_35804604==\_  
Content-Type: application/mac-binhex40; name="Violence\_on\_TV"  
Content-Disposition: attachment; filename="Violence\_on\_TV"

-----\_35804604==\_--

No. of Copies rec'd 1  
List ABCDE

MM 93-48

RECEIVED

From: <scalleg1@ic3.ithaca.edu>  
 To: A16.A16(kidstv)  
 Date: 10/13/95 5:08pm  
 Subject: Violence in television

OCT 13 1995

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

Honorable Commissioners;

The current quality of television programming may be harmful to child viewers, if not properly regulated or monitored. Various studies have shown that there is a direct link between violence on television and aggressive, violent attitudes of children. The article, "Sex, violence, and the TV set," in the January 1993 issue of Parent's Magazine states, "there is a correlation between the viewing of violent material and aggressive behavior-regular viewers behave more aggressively than occasional ones." A prime example of television's violent content on children is the November 1994 conviction of two eleven year old boys in Liverpool, England. The two boys abducted and killed a two year old child. Part of the blame was directed towards the boys' exposure to violent videos.

There may be some valid strategies in deterring the problem, however. One being disclaimer laws. Some television programs display a warning of their content before they are aired. Usually these warnings appear before programs that contain excessive violence, nudity, foul language, and other scenes of adult oriented nature. However, this is not enough. Warnings should be posted on all programs consisting of unsuitable matter for children. Therefore, the parental authority of the household can determine whether the program is appropriate for the child, before it even starts. These warnings should even appear on shows that are aired late at night. Stricter regulations of this sort should be enforced as soon as possible. Children need positive role models and entertainment in order to reveal the positive sides of themselves. Not enough attention is given to them as far as programming is concerned. The children are the future of society. Therefore, programming should depict more positive societal scenes, rather than the negative aspects of society which it more commonly focuses on. They need to be given the incentive to play an equitable role in their communities.

The National Cable Association recognizes this problem and has been developing a plan that would permit parents to scramble television shows that they do not want their children to watch. Presently, there is a different device out on the market that curbs the time that the child is allowed to watch television. It is called a "TV Allowance Box." When the time that the parent allots for the child to watch television is up, the set automatically shuts off. This device also has the ability to enforce a video blackout at certain times of the day, when a parent knows a program she disapproves of is on.

Therefore, I propose that stronger laws be made concerning the quality of programming to protect younger viewers. Television can have a powerful effect on children, and that effect should be positive. If we want to make this world a safer and more desirable place to live in, we have to start by showing children programs that exhibit moral virtues. It is valid to argue that it will improve the behavior and attitudes of kids, just as it has been argued that the current violence in television contributes to their aggressive behavior. If parents are not satisfied at present, however, they can control their child's television viewing with devices such as the "TV Allowance Box."

Sincerely yours,  
 Staci Callegari  
 319 Clarke Hall  
 Ithaca College  
 Ithaca, N.Y.  
 14850-7220

CC: scalleg1 <scalleg1@ic3.ithaca.edu>

No. of Copies rec'd \_\_\_\_\_  
 List ABCDE \_\_\_\_\_

MM 93-48

RECEIVED

OCT 13 1995

**From:** Ken Burton <kenb@wpmail.code3.com>  
**To:** A16.A16(kidstv)  
**Date:** 10/13/95 5:16pm  
**Subject:** Children's Programming

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

Because of the violence and sappy stuff on tv, my children are restricted to one program per day ... and at that the programs they choose are not education, have few if any morals, and are generally not up-lifting. I don't watch TV at all except for an occasional football game (2 or 3 per year), news once a month, and Star Trek once or twice a month.

They mimic patterns of sarcasm, crudity, base humor, and personal slams that they see and hear. I DON'T LIKE IT AT ALL!!!

Ken Burton (five children) kenb@wpmail.code3.com  
Utah

No. of Copies rec'd \_\_\_\_\_  
List ABCDE \_\_\_\_\_